

Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding COMMUNITY BUILDERS and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

<u>Dispute Codes</u> OPR

Introduction

This hearing dealt with the landlord's application pursuant to the *Residential Tenancy Act* ("*Act*") for:

• an Order of Possession for unpaid rent, pursuant to section 55.

The tenant did not attend this hearing, which lasted approximately 14 minutes. The landlord's two agents, landlord MAC ("landlord") and "landlord MIC" attended the hearing and were each given a full opportunity to be heard, to present affirmed testimony, to make submissions and to call witnesses. The landlord confirmed that she was the coordinator and landlord MIC confirmed that he is the shift supervisor for the "landlord company" named in this application and that both had authority to represent it as agents at this hearing.

The landlord testified that she served the tenant with the landlord's application for dispute resolution hearing package on September 28, 2016, by way of posting it to the rental unit door where the tenant still resides. In accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the landlord's application on October 1, 2016, three days after its posting.

The landlord testified that she served the tenant with the landlord's 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities, dated September 6, 2016 ("10 Day Notice"), on the same date, by way of posting it to the rental unit door where the tenant still resides. The landlord provided a signed, witness proof of service with this application, confirming the above information. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the landlord's 10 Day Notice on September 9, 2016, three days after its posting.

Issues to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent?

Background and Evidence

The landlord testified regarding the following facts. This tenancy began on July 1, 2016 for a fixed term of three months after which the tenant was required to move out on September 30, 2016. Monthly rent in the amount of \$425.00 is payable on the first day of each month. A security deposit of \$212.50 was paid by the tenant and the landlord continues to retain this deposit. A written tenancy agreement was signed by the tenant and a copy was provided for this hearing. The tenant continues to reside in the rental unit.

The landlord issued the 10 Day Notice, indicating an effective move-out date of September 15, 2016. The notice states that rent of \$425.00 was due on September 1, 2016. The landlord maintained that the tenant has not made any payments towards rent for September, October or November 2016.

<u>Analysis</u>

The landlord provided undisputed evidence at this hearing, as the tenant did not attend. The tenant failed to pay the full rent due on September 1, 2016, within five days of being deemed to have received the 10 Day Notice. The tenant has not made an application pursuant to section 46(4) of the *Act* within five days of being deemed to have received the 10 Day Notice. In accordance with section 46(5) of the *Act*, the failure of the tenant to take either of the above actions within five days led to the end of this tenancy on September 19, 2016, the corrected effective date on the 10 Day Notice.

In this case, this required the tenant and anyone on the premises to vacate the premises by September 19, 2016. As this has not occurred, I find that the landlord is entitled to a two (2) day Order of Possession against the tenant, pursuant to section 55 of the *Act*. I find that the landlord's 10 Day Notice complies with section 52 of the *Act*.

Conclusion

Page: 3

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two (2) days after service on the tenant**. Should the tenant or anyone on the premises fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

This decision is made on authority delegated to me by the Director of the Residential Tenancy Branch under Section 9.1(1) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*.

Dated: November 21, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch